

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 14, 2009.

Applicant respectfully requests that the amendment filed by Applicant on December 14, 2009 not be entered, and that the amendment currently enclosed herewith be entered instead.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 14, 2009, Claims 1-17, 33-66 and 69-74 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 9, 38, 41, 55, 58 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-11, 13-17, 33-43, 45-60, 62-66, 69-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040254884 A1, hereinafter Haber) in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,310,677, hereinafter Cohen). Claims 12, 44, 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040254884 A1, hereinafter Haber) in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,310,677, hereinafter Cohen) further in view of Kusterer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050076311, hereinafter Kusterer).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1-13, 33-36, 38-42, 44-45, 50-51, 55-56, 58-59 and 61-62, cancels Claims 14-17, 46-49, 63-66, and 69-74, and adds new Claim 75, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-13, 33-45, 50-62 and 75.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, Claims 9, 38, 41, 55, 58 were objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, Claims 9, 38, 41, 55, 58 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, conform with the requirements. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-11, 13-17, 33-43, 45-60, 62-66, 69-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040254884 A1, hereinafter Haber) in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,310,677, hereinafter Cohen).

Claims 12, 44, 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haber et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040254884 A1, hereinafter Haber) in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,310,677, hereinafter Cohen) further in view of Kusterer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050076311, hereinafter Kusterer).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented interactive tool that can configure a portal, comprising:

a microprocessor that is capable of running a plurality of user interfaces;

a first user interface, of the plurality of user interfaces, operable to manage the portal, wherein the portal contains at least one portlet to display one or more contents of a plurality of contents in a content repository;

a second user interface, of the plurality of user interfaces, operable to manage personalization of the portal, wherein the second user interface displays a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality of content selectors, wherein the content selector hierarchy allows the at least one portlet to be associated with a selected content selector from the plurality of content selectors, and wherein each content selector of the plurality of content selectors, when selected, can cause different content to be displayed on the at least one portlet based on evaluation of personalization rules for each said content selector, wherein the personalization rules for each said content selector contain natural language phrases that are editable using a context-sensitive editor, wherein the context-sensitive editor allows a user to change any pre-selected highlighted phrase in the personalization rules.

Haber discloses an interface for accessing objects in one or more object repositories. The interface comprises a tree panel for displaying at least a portion of the object hierarchy; an object panel for displaying an object interface; and an editor for each of a plurality of object types (Abstract).

However, as stated in the pending Office Action, Haber does not teach that each content selector can cause different content to be displayed based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules. Hence, there is also no indication in Haber that an interface can display a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality of contain selectors, wherein each content selector can cause different content to be displayed based on evaluation of personalization rules.

Cohen discloses using predefined rules to control the behavior of the portal. The rules include conditions and instructions. (Column 1, Lines 55-58).

However, the conditions in Cohen are in “*a specified format, such as XML, and list of [name, value] tuples*” (Column 2, Lines 2-4), whereas the personalization rules for each said content selector, as embodied in Claim 1, contain natural language phrases that are editable using a context-sensitive editor.

In addition, there is also no indication in Cohen that an interface can display a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality of content selectors.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 33 and 50

The comments provided above with regard to Claims 33 and 50 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 33 and 50 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 33 and 50, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13, 34-45, and 51-62

Claims 2-13, 34-45, and 51-62 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 33, and 50. Claims 2-13, 34-45, and 51-62 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as they depend from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Additional Amendments

Claim 75 has been newly added by the present Reply. Subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests that new Claim 75 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 14, 2010

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928